

THE WEEKLY FREE PRESS, 5 cents per copy, 50 cents for three months, \$1.00 for six months, \$2.00 a year, postage free.

Advertisements and subscriptions received at the office, 120 College Street, Boston. Full advertising rates sent on application.

Accounts cannot be opened for subscriptions. Subscribers will please remit by order, names are not entered until payment is received, and all papers are stopped at the end of the term paid for.

Remittance at the risk of the subscriber unless made by registered letter, or by check or postal order payable to the Publishers.

The date when the subscription expires is on the address-label of each paper, the change of which to a subsequent date becomes a receipt for remittance. No other receipt is sent unless requested. The receipt of the paper is a sufficient receipt for the first subscription. When a change of address is desired, both the old and new addresses should be given.

## The Free Press.

BURLINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1886.

PUBLISHED BY  
THE FREE PRESS ASSOCIATION,  
G. G. BENDIS, Editor.

Terms—\$2.00 a year, always in advance.

### Republican State Nominations.

For Governor,  
E. J. ORMSBEE, of Brandon.  
For Lieutenant-Governor,  
LEVI K. FULLER, of Brattleboro.  
For Treasurer,  
WM. H. DU BOIS, of Randolph.  
For Auditor of Accounts,  
E. H. POWELL, of Richmond.  
For Secretary of State,  
CHARLES W. PORTER, of Montpelier.

For Member of Congress, First District,  
JOHN W. STEWART, of Middlebury.

### County Nominations.

For Senators,  
WM. WELLS, of Burlington,  
A. J. STEVENS, of Colchester,  
SMITH WRIGHT, of Williston.  
For Assistant Judges,  
J. E. SMITH, of South Burlington,  
T. W. R. NICHOLS, of Essex.  
For Judge of Probate,  
TORREY E. WALKER, of Burlington.  
For State's Attorney,  
D. J. FOSTER, of Burlington.  
For Sheriff,  
JOSEPH BARTON, of Charlotte.  
For High Bailiff,  
S. H. MACOMBER, of Westford.

Mr. Parnell emphatically denies the statement that the National Leaguers are united with the Fenians.

Boycotting, has been declared a crime in New York, Wisconsin and Connecticut. This ought to fix its legal status pretty conclusively.

The telegraph informs us that large numbers of tanners in Salem and Lynn, Mass., have gone out. We trust they are well supplied with latch-keys.

President Cleveland tried to veto his sister's literary aspirations, but the veto has not been sustained. The president will find the fair sex harder to deal with than the politicians.

Colonel Gilder is having a little frigid experience by way of preparation for the rigors of the extreme north. By the time he gets ready to start again we are afraid it will be the close season on Poles.

The Democrats of Massachusetts have come to the conclusion that that old war-horse, Benjamin F. Butler, would make them a good congressman. But Benjamin doesn't think so. He has fixed his eye upon some loftier grapes.

One of the arguments in favor of river and harbor appropriations for New Hampshire, is that the channels of the rivers there might be so enlarged that whales could run inland, and so afford a new industry for the farmers.

The wrestle of the Senate with the oleomargarine bill bids fair to be as sharp as it will doubtless be decisive. Senator Edmunds takes the right ground and is working effectively for the bill and for the interests of his constituents in Vermont.

Mr. Powderly said, in his recent address to the bottle-blowers, that he "always smashed the ginger ale bottles which came into the house, to make the bottle trade good." Ginger ale seems to have had a rather stimulating effect upon Mr. Powderly.

Certain ill-advised friends of Mr. Gladstone want him to remain in office instead of resigning, now that the defeat of home rule is assumed. Mr. Gladstone, we imagine, is not that sort of a man. Whether defeated or victorious, he will do the fair thing.

The murderer "Maxwell"—whose real name is Hugh M. Brooks—richly deserves the sentence which has been pronounced upon him. There has seldom been a more scandalous attempt to defeat justice, than appears in the history of this man's defense.

It is said that the expelled Orleans princes have been raising large loans on their estates. This fact has a rather suspicious look. It is hardly possible that they need the money to pay their living expenses merely.

It seems to excite no particular concern in Congress or anywhere else, that our silver dollar has crawled to the low notch of 74 1/2 cents valuation in London. Still there would seem to be some significance in the announcement.

Minister Cox evidently dislikes his confinement in the sleepy realm of the Sultan, and has not been slow in seizing the opportunity afforded by the bite of an oriental dog to visit Mr. Pasteur in the gayest city of France. Mr. Cox is a very shrewd diplomatist—that is why we laugh.

There seems to be good authority for the announcement that an extradition treaty has at last been agreed upon between the United States and Great Britain. Such a treaty has long been needed, and the people of both countries will no doubt rejoice should the report that it has been signed prove true.

A Republican contemporary suggests that if President Cleveland is really anxious to get rid of Mr. Garland, he might do it gracefully, and comparatively to the

satisfaction of the attorney-general, by appointing him minister to Austria. Austria is rather exacting. We doubt whether she would receive a minister of Mr. Garland's stamp.

Congressman Whitney of Massachusetts thinks that the president's vetoes of the private pension bills are wrong because the amount involved in each is so small—only \$4 a month. But it isn't so much the smallness of the expenditure in individual cases that the friends of the soldiers contend for, as it is the principle involved.

As the new extradition treaty is not retroactive, American defaulters who have already taken up their abode in the queen's domains, or who shall do so before the treaty goes into effect, cannot be called for by Uncle Sam. But there seems little doubt that the growth of the "American colony" in Canada will be stopped in the near future—and the sooner the better.

The "horizontal reduction" of the river and harbor bill by the Senate, while frowned upon by the spoilsmen who hold the Democratic grab-bag, is probably all that will save that measure from the president's veto. This reduction fixes the total appropriation at just three-fourths of the sum which the Democratic House had arranged for, and will still leave more than enough for many of the "improvements," projected.

Writers on hygiene are now engaged in their annual attempt to cry down summer drinks of all kinds. "Drink very moderately; rinse your mouth after, and pour water on the wrists rather than down the throat," is their dictum. But when a person is desperately thirsty (inside and outside) to him, "drink!" he doesn't waste much cooling liquid on his wrists. He obeys the inner rather than the outward monitor.

The Boston Traveller thinks that the 1st of August will find Congress still in session. The Morrison resolution is still to be discussed; the Senate will want time for the discussion of the remaining appropriation bills; the House has the oleomargarine bill on the docket; and there are the Mormon bill and the president's vetoes demanding the attention of Congress. It is plain that if an adjournment is had before mid-summer, an immense amount of unfinished business will be left over.

The New York Tribune's "fresh air children" are again enjoying the unfamiliar delights of country life—growing fat and unburned and learning what it is to be happy. We know of no more commendable and beautiful charity than this, and we are glad that it has grown to be a permanent institution. The Tribune, and all who contribute to its fund, and all who entertain the little waifs in their country homes, are doing a beneficent, kindly, Christian work which cannot fail of its reward.

Mr. Gladstone is a man of that indomitable perseverance which is born of high resolve. He has committed himself to a plan of action which he believes to be right, and which must triumph in the end by the inevitable ascendancy of right. He announces that he will conduct "an uncompromising opposition," so far as the great issue of home rule is concerned, against the victorious conservative party. He will never demand less for Ireland than was embodied in his recent appeal to the people. Ireland is fortunate to have such an ally as Mr. Gladstone.

Scientists in this country are beginning to seek an explanation for the alleged fact that lightning strikes much more frequently and is so much more destructive to life and property, than it used to be twenty-five or thirty years ago. There have been very few serious thunder storms in this section of the country the present season, but reports from other quarters of New England show that the proportion of deaths and of fires from lightning is larger than usual. Here is a problem which the practical science of to-day is called upon to solve.

The appointment of Governor Thompson of South Carolina to the office of assistant secretary of the treasury is regarded in Washington as a direct snub to Appointment Clerk Higgins. Thompson is described as a resolute civil service reformer—while Higgins, as is well known, does not believe in civil service reform, either theoretically or practically. But, just why President Cleveland should wish to snub Mr. Higgins, while retaining him in office, is not apparent. The most effective way to express disapproval of Mr. Higgins and his methods would be to practice a little civil service reform upon him.

The New York Sun, which is a very particular and intolerant purist in the use of the English language, speaks, in a recent issue, of "a pretty muscular woman, 23 years old, in an affidavit, with closely-cropped brown hair." We find ourselves at a loss to know whether the lady in question was dressed in an affidavit, or whether she was 23 years old in an affidavit; also whether she or the affidavit displayed the "closely cropped brown hair." Here is a good chance for the Boston Journal to take its illustrations contemporary to task with its sententious, "Says."

Politics this fall will be made up of many strands. Out in Dakota the farmers have formed an alliance, held a convention and decided to place a ticket in the field. Their platform declares for a territorial commission, to be elected by the people and with full power to fix rates of transportation; for the taxation of corporate property the same as farming land, and for the taxation of mortgages. No doubt this action of the Dakota farmers will have its effect on other parts of the country. Railroad commissions, and the lessening of the burden of taxation upon farmers are live issues.

The true nature of Mr. Morrison's resolution in Congress, providing that whenever the surplus in the treasury shall exceed \$100,000,000 the secretary shall apply it in sums of not less than \$10,000,000 per month to the payment of the National debt, was pretty clearly brought out by the debate which that resolution provoked. A number of able Republicans took part in the discussion, and made it pretty evident that the resolution was simply a cloak for a Democratic job in the interests of the silver men. It is fortunate that

there are some clear-headed and honest men in Congress.

Instead of doing away altogether with the special delivery system, the postoffice department would like to have it extended to all postoffices in the country, and a bill to this effect is before Congress. It is thought that in small places the special delivery system would be considered more of a privilege and would be more generally used. There is some sense in this suggestion, but the system probably can not begin to pay its expenses, were it extended as proposed.

Those who believe that Miss Rose Elizabeth Cleveland has any literary qualifications over and above her notoriety as ex first-lady of the land, ought to read a few of the extracts from her latest so-called novel, "The Long Run." The whole thing is simply absurd. For instance, take this dialectic passage in which "the Olympian Rufus" addresses "the haughty Emeline":

You stand so helpless, Emeline. On a sudden there has come upon you so pitiful a pillage of all your refinement, your self-containedness, your dignity of disguise. You stand so uncovered, Emeline. Your face, always so harmonized to the mild emotions of good society, has lost its veil, and confronts me in the divine contortion of its infinite passion—das ewig Weibliche. I do not love you, Emeline, but you love me. I take your long hands, Emeline, and fold them over your heart. They must be its shield. Go your way and let me go mine!

### Stealing the Public Lands.

Our government has been altogether too liberal in its disposal of the public lands, and its liberality has been shamefully abused. That hundreds of thousands of acres of government land have been stolen, or obtained under false pretences, evidence is not wanting to show. Public lands can be taken up in five different ways—by pre-emption, homestead, soldier's homestead, timber culture and desert reclamation. Now it is quite possible, by a system of perjury and false swearing, for unprincipled men to obtain possession of numerous tracts of public land, at the expense of honest settlers and the loss of public revenue. Thus titles to large estates have been obtained by those who have fulfilled hardly a single one of the conditions prescribed in the statutes. It is asserted that fully 90 per cent of the entries in the territory of New Mexico are fraudulent.

That these abuses of the government's confidence have also been in some cases, aided by the rascality or incompetency of government land agents is very well known. Some of the methods of stealing public lands are so transparent that it would seem as though the fraud could hardly be overlooked, yet the government's agents profess to be entirely innocent of the deception. For instance, the cattle companies have secured immense tracts of land, under the timber culture law, by simply planting a few saplings amid some hundreds of rootless sticks; and, although the first blasts of spring have destroyed nearly all that is planted, the ranchman and his neighbors have sworn that the trees are in good growing condition. The desert reclamation privileges have been abused by entering claims for lands, which are good bottom tracts, as though they were sterile. This villainy, which has operated to the damage of many miles of back country, has been accomplished with the aid of surveyors in the employ of the land office.

A corporation of foreigners, known as the Maxwell Land company, has driven honest settlers off land in New Mexico and Colorado, pretending to have titles to more than 700,000 acres, whereas the original grant does not entitle it to more than 90,000 acres. Treaty stipulations between the United States and Mexico have been twisted, or falsely cited, to support the claims of certain Spanish Americans to hundreds of thousands of acres in New Mexico. The statement is made that these claims are greatly in excess of what the several claimants are justly entitled to hold under the treaties, the demands for patents being all the way from twice to ten times the rights defined in the original grants by the Mexican government.

All these abuses, of course, might be stopped now—however far they have gone in the past—by the repeal of the pre-emption, timber culture and desert reclamation laws, which seem to be the most abused. Congress, however, will probably not repeal these laws at present. The most, therefore, that can be done is to secure justice against the offenders in all possible cases, at the hands of the law. We are glad to learn that a case of this kind has recently been tried in San Francisco, in which a United States grand jury has found indictments for subornation of perjury against eight men, characterized as "leading citizens," three of whom represent a capital of \$5,000,000, and all are said to be wealthy. This particular rascality has been discovered through the efforts of a special agent of the department of the interior. The men indicted are members of the California Redwood company, the capital of which is mainly held in Scotland, and the steel was accomplished in the following manner: The indicted persons induced some 600 American citizens to take up 100 acres of land each, for which each received \$50. The entries were then conveyed to David Evans, one of the indicted persons. The California Redwood company next sent an agent to Scotland to form a syndicate and sell the lands. The syndicate paid the company \$20 an acre for the land.

More than three months have been devoted by the government agent to this case, and testimony has been secured from over 100 persons who accepted bribes. The government will institute suits to set aside all entries and patents already issued to these persons. It would be well if similar rascalities in other parts of the West could be similarly dealt with.

### Growing Prosperity of the South.

The South is so rapidly growing in material prosperity, its resources are being so rapidly developed, and its prospect for the future is so bright, that even the chronic grumblers, who are always harping on the "old regime," have been obliged to withdraw until a more convenient season. During the past year many important enterprises have been organized at the South—enterprises which by their magnitude, and the confidence with which they are undertaken, show that the people of the South take no stock themselves in the lugubrious whinnings of their false prophets. Among the various projects which have been undertaken is that of

an immense dry dock at the tide-water terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio railway—an enterprise which will involve the expenditure of fully half a million dollars, and will probably result in the establishment of an iron ship building yard at that port. Also at Chattanooga steps have been taken towards the construction of steel and iron works. In Alabama a company has been organized to build an iron furnace and charcoal works, and among other enterprises in that State may be mentioned a knitting factory, three large saw mills, a cotton compress, a cheese factory and coke works. In Arkansas there is to be a new lumber mill company, a gold mining company, a stove factory, a water works company and a furniture factory; in Kentucky a coal mining company, coke works and new stone quarries; in Louisiana, a rice mill and a mining company; in Mississippi, water works and brick works; in North and South Carolina, a cotton mill, shoe factory, furniture factory, flour mills, fertilizer works, tar-pentine distilleries and cotton mill improvements; in Tennessee there is to be a new marble quarrying company, an ice factory, a broom factory, a flour mill, several saw-mills; in Texas, an oil and cotton company, a flour mill and elevator, a water pipe foundry and two water works companies.

These enterprises certainly do not look as though the South were in a crippled or hopeless condition. On the contrary, they show that the spirit of enterprise, of industry, of hopefulness is growing and spreading throughout that section of the country. The very fact that money for these large enterprises is freely obtained, shows the faith that both Northern and Southern capitalists have in the future of the South. We believe that the time is not far off when the Southern States will vie with the Northern and Western in productiveness of every sort. And this result would never have been attained had the "old regime" continued.

### The Edmunds Civil Service Bill

Provides that the president alone shall have the power to appoint all the officers he has heretofore appointed, with the advice and consent of the senate, except the following: Heads of departments, assistant secretaries, assistant postmaster-general, assistant attorneys-general, ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls. Justices and judges of the courts of the United States, including the supreme court of the District of Columbia, the supreme courts of the territories, and the court of claims. Officers in the military and naval service of the United States, collectors of customs in districts in which the gross revenues collected in any one year exceed— the treasurer and assistant treasurers of the United States, controller of the currency, commissioner of internal revenue, controller of the treasury, auditors of the treasury, commissioner of customs, register of the treasury, solicitor-general, director of the mint, the supervising inspector of steamboats, supervising surgeon-general, solicitor-general. The chiefs of the several bureaus of the navy department, namely, of ordnance, of equipment and recruiting, of yards and docks, of provisions and clothing, of medicine and surgery, and of construction and repair. The commissioners of Indian affairs, of the land-office, of patents, of pensions, of education, of railroads, and of agriculture. The public printer, members of the national board of health, and commissioners of the civil service.

The above would still require confirmation by the senate; but the appointment of all other officers would be vested in the president, except those already vested by law in the heads of departments or other officers. The bill further provides that they should hold office for four years; but that whenever the president or the head of department superior shall have reason to believe that any officer so appointed has been guilty of malfeasance in office, or neglect of duty, or of any official or personal misconduct, he may temporarily suspend such officer, and application shall be immediately made to the circuit justice, circuit judge or district judge of the district (or if in the District of Columbia to the supreme court of the District), for his removal. The judge shall require the officer to show cause upon reasonable notice why he should not be removed, and hear "in a summary way" the case and determine and decide whether he ought to be removed or not.

As has been stated the bill is in fact based upon the recent decision of the supreme court, affirming the power of Congress to regulate removals in the case of officers whose appointment is vested in the president or in the heads of departments or in the courts, under the constitutional authority so to vest the appointments of inferior officers. Its effect would be to enable the president to appoint all postmasters, nearly all collectors and all marshals, district attorneys, etc., without reference to the senate, except for a term of four years. But he could not remove any one so appointed without cause established to the satisfaction of a United States judge.

The Edmunds bill would limit removals in the classes of offices named to causes arising from considerations of efficiency and reputable character and prevent removals for purely political reasons which are the greatest danger and evil of the civil service. It would not prevent heads of bureaus from dismissing incompetent clerks, as at present. In a letter quoted by the Springfield Republican Mr. Edmunds says:

I think that when the people of the United States get to be really in favor of taking the great mass of merely administrative offices out of the list of spoils and prizes to be struggled for by political parties, they will see that the only means of doing it effectually will be provisions of the character mentioned in this bill. I do not know any state in the Union that has even tolerated the idea of authorizing its governor to dismiss public officers at will, and I think the people of every state see that it would be totally inadmissible that, in respect of officers elected or appointed, their tenure during the period for which they were elected or appointed should depend upon the mere discretion or caprice of any one man or two men. All this is, of course, perfectly consistent with the fact that there must be a speedy means of expelling from the public service officers who misconduct themselves. And such means are best found, I think, in a rapid, summary, judicial proceeding. It has long been perfectly obvious to me, and will be to you or any one else who was constantly in the senate, with open doors or closed doors, that the check of the senate on the president's power of appointment is almost nil. Given a vacancy, there has not been, I suppose, one percent of rejections during the period of the government, when I think there ought to have been probably 20 percent; not because this 20 percent of people were necessarily bad men, but unsuitable men, not representing the average of the best people of the

community, etc. As every president therefore now knows that practically he can select whom he pleases to fill vacancies, I see no danger whatever in allowing him to make those selections on his own responsibility in form, as he does now in substance, and we shall thus get rid of roll-rolling and lobbying and something perhaps of importunities of senators in respect of appointments; and the man being once selected, he becomes as independent in the just exercise of his official duties as presidents and senators and members of Congress are in theirs.

### The Argument of Desperation.

A correspondent, over the signature of "Free Rum," advances, in another column, the argument, if it can be called such, for the existence of a political prohibition party, that it may, by making things very much worse for a time, at last bring about a condition of affairs which shall arouse the people from their torpor on the temperance question, and secure in the end more effective restriction of the liquor traffic. Having done in his day perhaps more than any one man in Chittenden county has done to sustain law, repress intemperance and arouse and sustain a wholesome public sentiment on the temperance question, our correspondent now, if his words mean what they seem to mean, in his older and what ought to be wiser days, almost despairs of any further promotion of the cause by direct and straightforward effort; adopts the signature of "Free Rum," and is almost willing to try a period of free rum, of indefinite duration, in the hope that it may sometime be followed by more rigid prohibition. He sees, as every intelligent man must, that the first result of the organization of a prohibition party, in any Republican State, must be aid and comfort to the allied powers of Democracy and whiskey;—but he flouts temperance men who are willing to welcome the full reign of these powers, in the expectation that their reign will become unendurable and in time arouse a rebellion against whiskey, if not against Democracy. In this way they are willing to work evil, or permit evil to be worked, that good may (perhaps) come. Expanded and put in other words this suggestion amounts to this: Prohibition has prevailed in Vermont for a generation, yet the curse of intemperance is not wiped out. True, less liquor is consumed in our State than in any other population of equal numbers on the globe. True, there are many towns in which no rum-hole or saloon is tolerated. True the traffic is everywhere under a ban, and under heavy risks; the liquor that is sold is sold in closets and underground dives and secret places. No sign or placed of attractive poisons, no array of bottles and demijohns with seductive labels, no open bar attracts the drunkard, or the man who has begun to form the habit of drink. The man who wants liquor as a beverage must go to look for it, and sneak out of sight, and invite another man to break a law, in order to obtain it. It is true that there was a gathering of fifteen thousand people in the largest city in the State on the last Fourth of July, and the officers of the law attended well to their duty, and but three men were arrested for intoxication. True that such a thing could not have begun to be possible in Plattsburgh or Whitehall or any town in any license State. True that the legislation of the State gives to the temperance men and women all that they ask in the way of legislation and makes the law constantly more stringent and easier to enforce. True that prosecutions under the law take place by hundreds throughout the State. True that every liquor dealer and saloon-keeper feels the pressure of the law and cordially hates it, and would pay heavily to get it repealed. True all this, and more—still liquor is sold and drunk. Saloons exist in spite of prosecutions and fines. Men get bottles filled at the drug stores. The law is often evaded and often violated. Young men are ruined by dissipation and drink; husbands become drunkards and wives and children suffer and starve. Therefore, because all the good is not done that we would like to see done, and all the wickedness, suffering and wrong from alcoholism that we would like to have prevented is not prevented, let us go over for a time to the enemy. Let us attack the organization that has given us all this restriction of the traffic; let us strike hands with its old opponent the Democratic party, which makes neither pretence or practice of support of temperance or resistance to rum. Welcome free rum, rather than a law which comes short of enacting the millennium! Welcome riot, pauperism, crime, the more the better, for the sooner will the reaction set in, and the people rally in stronger earnest against the demon of strong drink!

If this be good logic, it need not be confined to the temperance question. The laws against swindling, theft, adultery, murder, are constantly violated. The evils against which these statutes are aimed are not eradicated, therefore away with the statutes! Having tried in vain by legal enactments to abolish the evils, let us now give free rein to violence, lust and crime, in the hope that better social order may follow the period of chaos and despair. If this is good logic for a community or a party, it is good for an individual. If a father has a son inclined to dissipation let him not waste further time in entreaty or command, but rather say to him go ahead! Here are money, wine, women—now your wild oats—have out your fling; in time you will learn by sad experience that lawlessness is folly; in time with sated passions and ruined frame you will be compelled to abstain. There is no need to pursue the line of argument further. The man, if not utterly wrecked, may in time be led by the very violence of his passion to reform. The community, if not ruined in the process, may through social chaos, reach social order. The country, if not destroyed by free rum, may in time through free rum, reach more effective prohibition.

But at whose door meantime will lie the aggravated misery, crime, demoralization, and destruction involved in thus fighting fire with fire? Those who help to break down the existing barriers because they do not completely keep out the flood, must certainly take their share of the blame. They cannot escape it. We decline, for our part, to share any more blame than now belongs to us. We will countenance no policy of desperation. We will not help unchain any mad dog in the hope that after he has bitten people enough, they will turn to and kill him. The better way, as it seems to us, is to stand by the best men, the best measures, the best party

that we have, even though they are not perfect, and to try to do something, though it be imperfectly done, to make them better.

As we have said, the only practical result that can be achieved by a political prohibition party, in any Republican State, is to break down the Republican party. When that is broken down, the party that steps into its place will not be any prohibition party; but the Democratic party. If any prohibitionist thinks the Democratic party, flushed with success and fairly in the saddle, will give to him and his cause more help than the Republican party has given to the cause of prohibition in Vermont, we can have no argument with him. He will have to go ahead and try it on. Our correspondent "Free Rum" does not think anything of the kind. He knows better.

### Mr. Edmunds and His Corporation Practice.

The Washington correspondent of the New York World interviewed Senator Edmunds, the other day, on a subject to which the senator's enemies are giving considerable attention nowadays, and gives the result of his inquiries as follows:

I met Mr. Edmunds yesterday and had a general conversation with him upon the subject of senators practicing before the Supreme Court as the representatives of corporations. I had heard so much about Mr. Edmunds's corporation practice, that I ventured to ask him about it. What he said is of particular interest in view of the criticism which has been passed upon him for his opposition to the Beck bill. Senator Edmunds said very dryly: "You said in the World the other day that I had perhaps the largest corporation practice of any one of the senators. Where did you get that information?" My reply was that that information came generally from his friends. To this he said: "If any one were to take the pains to examine my record carefully or come to me to make inquiries, I am sure they would find that I have done less in the way of legal work for corporations than almost any man in public life. It is true that I have a very large legal practice, I am not denying that, and I do not understand that the general charge of my having a great amount of corporation practice is intended as an aspersion upon my character, but the real fact is that I have had very little corporation practice during my career as a public man. I never had as any regular connection with a corporation with the exception of the Vermont Central railroad. I have been the advisory counsel of that corporation for some years, receiving a small annual fee. On the last of last January I resigned that connection. Its legal business was practically at an end and I saw no further use for my services."

"The first corporation case that I had of any importance which I now call to mind was that of a Scottish corporation, some 10 or 12 years ago, in a suit against the Missouri, Kansas and Texas railroad, in the West. I have, perhaps, in all my career had five or six corporation clients, but in cases where the government's interest was in no way involved, I never have been the attorney of any of the land grant railroads, and have never acted professionally for them in any way. I appeared in the Supreme Court as counsel in what is known as the California tax cases, but in that I really represented some interests. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The State of California had passed an unconstitutional tax, and if the principle of the legislation had been sustained it would have been possible for States to have taxed private corporations out of existence. My interest in that case was one of public interest. The